DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 029 CG 000 545

TITLE Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Collaboration Research Program.
SPONS AGENCY Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [64]
NOTE 24p.; For related documents, see ED 012 485 and CG 000 544; Some lines may not be legible due to print quality original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Correctional Rehabilitation; Counseling; *Evaluation; Prisoners; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Rehabilitation Programs; *Remedial Programs; Research Proposals; *Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS *Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program; Washington (Seattle)

ABSTRACT

This paper gives the specifics of a federal offenders rehabilitation program implementation and evaluation which will test and demonstrate the effects of providing intensive vocational rehabilitation services to federal offenders. The authors note that criminal offenders have difficulty in vocational adjustment, and this is exacerbated by their criminal status. Despite this, the criteria for rehabilitation services are limited to mentally or physically handicapped prisoners. The project is designed to provide and evaluate such services to larger segments of federal prison inmates; thus, the research program will attempt to contribute to the field of rehabilitation through the empirical evaluation of "current" as contrasted to "intensive" services offered to federal offenders, as well as ascertaining the effects of such variables as time of service. The paper details the various aspects of the project, such as choice of institutions, exact dimensions to be studied, controls, design, and methods of evaluation. [This report is dated 1964, but should be considered by those currently involved in prison reform efforts.] (Author/NG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED119029

FEDERAL OFFENDERS REHABILITATION COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM

I. FEDERAL OFFENDERS REHABILITATION PROGRAM

A. PURPOSE

This is a collaborative research study, the purpose of which is to test and demonstrate the effects of providing intensive vocational rehabilitation services to federal offenders at specified stages in the correctional process. Clients for this program will be randomly divided into demonstration and control groups. Included in these groups will be those offenders normally eligible for vocational rehabilitation services under Federal-State criteria because of physical or mental handicaps, plus those with social handicaps who are not otherwise eligible. The specific objectives are:

1. To determine the needs of federal offenders for vocational rehabilitation services according to their physical, mental, or social handicaps.

2. To provide intensive vocational rehabilitation services to federal offenders who have been randomly assigned to demonstration groups.

3. To develop measures of success of "intensive" versus "current" services in the vocational rehabilitation of federal offenders.

4. To develop related studies and take advantage of research opportunities as they appear in the planning of data collection and in data analysis.

5. To study the impact of providing intensive rehabilitation services to offenders upon the attitudes and practices of the professional staff in various agencies involved in the correctional process.

6. To develop recommendations for changes in administrative procedures and public laws relating to the correctional and rehabilitation fields.

CG 000 545

B. TYPE: Collaborative research and demonstration

The participating agencies are the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the U. S. Probation System, the U. S. Parole Board, and the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. The operating agencies will be the selected state agencies affiliated with the VRA.

The collaborative process will also be extended across areas of professional specialization such as parole, probation, vocational, social, physical, and mental rehabilitation.

The developmental nature of the collaborative research process includes the following ten phases as applied to this program:

Phase I	VRA selects an area of research needing investigation.
Phase II	VRA selects an agency meeting predetermined criteria to direct overall research.
Phase III	VRA selects other participating agencies and makes initial contacts with these agencies on broad general terms.
Phase IV	Directing agency prepares overall research design and designates the role of each participating agency.
Phase V	Directing agency prepares tentative guidelines and supplies these with specific instructions to each participating agency.
Phase VI	Each participating agency prepares the Grant Application for its project.
Phase VII	Each agency and the directing agency presents the Grant Application for its project within established deadlines to VRA for review and approval action.
Phase VIII	All participating agencies begin projects on the same date. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation for all projects will be centralized in the directing agency.

Phase IX — All administrative procedures relative to VRA grants will be followed and additional data will be furnished to the directing agency to provide a basis for comparison of individuals, techniques, procedures, and methods.

Phase X — Directing agency will prepare comprehensive report of whole program.

C. JUSTIFICATION

1. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Criminal offenders have long been known to experience difficulties in vocational adjustment. They typically have a history of irregular employment, and the acquisition of criminal status further limits their employability. Such offenders present a wide variety of handicaps, the variety being especially great in a population drawn from all regions of the United States. Although most of their handicaps appear to be remediable, such offenders are frequently ineligible for rehabilitation services, and they are, in any case, disinclined to utilize to the full such services as may be available to them. This project will provide intensive vocational rehabilitation services to a randomly selected number of such offenders in order to evaluate the effectiveness of such services.

2. SALIENCY OF THE PROBLEM ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

The necessity of having a well-organized empirical investigation comparing intensive and current rehabilitation services has been pointed out by several researchers in recent years. The two principal studies to be cited here indicate that this is a general need not restricted to any particular locale or region of the country.

Studies by Glaser and by Brewer have revealed that federal offenders who have been incarcerated tend to be over-optimistic as to their adjustment to law-abiding society upon release. These studies indicate that motivation for this kind of adjustment is high among incarcerated federal offenders.

A conclusion reached by Glaser in his detailed study of the federal prison system was that, "The prison employee

who has the greatest reformative influence on an offender is the one who is able to demonstrate sincere and sustained concern for and confidence in the offender's rehabilitation." [1]

This conclusion, based on a study of prisons in several states, not only points to the need for services prior to the offender's release, but also to the need for evaluating the effectiveness of rehabilitation services as now practiced as compared to "intensive" services.

While compatible with Glaser's findings, Brewer's study of federal offenders in Georgia and Florida also found that a large percentage of those desiring rehabilitation assistance and those who gave most promise of benefiting from this assistance were denied assistance. Denial of assistance was made on the basis that under Federal-State criteria, rehabilitation services can be rendered only to the physically or mentally handicapped. Even though these persons were motivated to receive and could benefit from rehabilitation services they were denied them, thus increasing the probability of their being re-arrested, re-convicted, and re-incarcerated.

This points out the need to extend rehabilitation services to federal offenders who are socially handicapped even though they may not have an identifiable physical or mental disability. Brewer concluded, "There is a need for additional assistance to prisoners in post-release rehabilitation and to probationers and parolees during their terms." [2]

These studies outline the need to compare current and intensive services at various stages of the correctional process. This need has long been felt by correctional and rehabilitation personnel across the country and is not confined to any one region. In the following section we shall indicate in some detail exactly how such an investigation

1. Daniel Glaser, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, Bobbs-Merrill, New York, 1964.

2. Earl D. C. Brewer, A Vocational Rehabilitation Study of Prisoners, Probationers, and Parolees. Mimeographed Report of Research done for the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education and Welfare under Grant No. SAU-1036-64.

may contribute to knowledge in the field of rehabilitation.

3. SPECIFIC CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE IN THE FIELD OF REHABILITATION

This collaborative research program is unique in that it will attempt to contribute to the development of knowledge in the field of rehabilitation through the empirical evaluation of the effectiveness of "current" as contrasted to "intensive" services offered to federal offenders. In addition, we need to know whether current or intensive service is more effective when given prior to sentencing, when the offender is on probation, when given prior to his release from an institution, when given while the offender is on parole, or when given subsequent to the offender's release from all forms of supervision.

Another unique feature of this research program is that it will have eight regional projects across the nation supplying the data with which to conduct the research study. The Program Director and his research staff will gather, analyze, and interpret these data in Seattle. The specific research contribution of each regional Project will derive from the stage in the correctional process from which it will draw its cases. In this way it will be possible to evaluate the impact of "intensive" versus "current" rehabilitation services not only according to the stage of the correctional process at which the client is, but also according to the region in the country where these services are provided to the offender.

There have been few investigations detailing the specific circumstances impeding the vocational adjustment of criminal offenders and even fewer inquiries into the special difficulties encountered in extending intensive vocational rehabilitation services to a population of criminal offenders. Exploratory analyses of the data generated by the present Program will make it possible to investigate clues which might suggest further improvement of vocational rehabilitation services for this specialized population.

In short, this collaborative research program will contribute to knowledge in the field of rehabilitation by means of a nationwide field experiment which will empirically assess the effectiveness of alternative types of rehabilitation

services under alternative conditions.

D. METHODOLCGY

1. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

An office will be established in Seattle to administer and coordinate the activities of the eight satellite projects located within seven separate states in seven VRA regions. The personnel at the Seattle office will include the Program Director, the Program Research Director, the Program Consultants, the Program Observer, the Program Secretary, and the Program Clerk. The planning and coordination required to obtain comparable information from eight satellite projects will be the responsibility of the Program Director. Each satellite Project Director will be responsible for the preparation of the VRA Grant Application for his Project, Project staffing, and reporting as required by the VRA and the Program Director. Each Project Director will interpret his own project in the light of local circumstances when he makes his progress and final reports.

2. DESIGN FOR FIELD EXPERIMENT

The basic purpose of this field experiment is to assess the effectiveness of alternative types of rehabilitation services under alternative conditions. In order to answer this question on a sound empirical research basis, it is necessary to decompose the problem into its component parts as follows: a. We must ascertain what is meant by the term "federal offenders." b. We must differentiate between "current" and "intensive" services. c. We must distinguish between "initial" and "subsequent" case classification. d. We must denote the specific stages in the correctional process from which cases will be drawn for this study, and how these cases will be assigned to experimental categories. e. We shall graphically describe the experimental comparative design which will be employed in the analysis. f. It is also necessary for us to specify a set a criteria by which effectiveness will be assessed. g. We must specify a plan for the selection of clients.

a. Definition of Federal Offender

In the present context, the term "federal offender" connotes a variety of dual statuses which a person may have with respect to federal legal processes and

to stages in the correctional process. A person may become a federal offender by being convicted in a federal court for violation of a federal law. A person may also become a federal offender by being convicted in a military court for violation of martial law. Thus, the term "federal offender" refers to an inclusive status with respect to federal legal processes which is entered into by a person upon conviction.

b. Types of Services to be provided

At the point of conviction the federal offender is ready to enter the correctional process which may be divided into three principal stages: pre-sentence, sentence, and post-sentence. Currently, rehabilitation services of various kinds are rendered to the federal offender at each of these stages. "Current" services at each of these stages vary according to the caseload of the officer having responsibility for the case, the saliency of the needs of the case, cost incurred by the responsible agency in attempting to meet these needs, and whether or not the offender himself actually asks for service.

In this Program, by contrast, a number of federal offenders selected according to specified criteria will be subjected to "intensive" rehabilitation services beginning at varying stages in the correctional process. By "intensive" services is meant that (a) a specially designated vocational rehabilitation officer will give special attention to these cases, (b) his caseload will be such as to make it possible to assess even the less salient needs of the case, (c) the Project will underwrite the appropriate rehabilitation services required without regard to their cost, and (d) service will be offered and provided to the case whether or not the offender himself asks for it initially. Determination of such services needed will be the professional responsibility of the counselor. It is anticipated that services to offenders will be intensive to the extent necessary to re-establish them in a productive and law-abiding role in society. Rehabilitation services may be provided to intensive service cases and to their dependents, provided, that services to dependents of intensive service cases may only be rendered when the dependents meet the eligibility requirements in section I. D. 2.d. 4) b) (6) of this plan (see page 15). These services may include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Motivation contacts. The counselor will exercise his own initiative to general interest in rehabilitation on the part of

the offender.

2. Medical diagnosis as needed to assess the nature and degree of disability or limitations.

3. Individual vocational counseling and guidance, including psychological testing, to help select and attain a vocational objective.

4. Personal adjustment counseling prior to and during the rehabilitation process.

5. Pre-vocational, vocational, or academic training considered necessary to reduce a social handicap in order to attain the vocational objective selected and agreed upon during counseling.

6. Maintenance and transportation during treatment, training, and any other phase of actual rehabilitation process, including a period not to exceed 60 days while the evaluative process is being conducted.

7. Medical, surgical, psychiatric and hospital services to remove or reduce a condition that causes a physical or mental vocational handicap.

8. Prosthetic appliances as necessary to successfully compete in the vocational objective selected.

9. Tools, equipment, initial stocks including livestock and occupational and business licenses are supplied if these are necessary to fit the individual for remunerative employment.

10. Placement services as necessary, considering the individual's physical, mental, and social handicaps in relation to the vocational objective selected.

11. Follow-up service as required to assure rehabilitation.

c. Initial Classification of cases

Prior to assigning a particular case either to "current" or to "intensive" rehabilitation service, it will be necessary to make an initial classification as to the rehabilitation needs of the particular offender. This will be done by the project officer first receiving a case and before coming into contact with the person about to enter the monitoring (data collection) system to be set up by the Program. Four initial classifications of the case will be possible: not eligible to monitoring by the Program because case fails to meet certain specified criteria (detailed below), eligible and likely to benefit from rehabilitation services, eligible but indeterminate as to likelihood of benefit from services, and eligible but not likely to benefit from services. Initial classifications will constitute one of the variables in the experimental design. However, it should be noted that cases will be randomly assigned (under "determination of eligibility") to "demonstration" and "control" categories in the experimental design without regard to initial classification. The purpose of initial classification is to assess empirically the validity of initial impressions made by counselors when looking only at a person's file record.

d. Specification of stages in the correctional process: Selection of clients

The overall objective of the Program is to compare the effectiveness of "current" versus "intensive" rehabilitation services. However, in order to evaluate unambiguously the effectiveness of these services on an empirical research basis, it is necessary to specify at what stage of the correctional process these comparisons are made. The program will draw cases from four stages in the correctional process: pre-sentence, probation, pre-release, post-release. Some cases will be picked up for monitoring by the Program prior to their actually being sentenced; that is, at the time the pre-sentence report is written. Therefore, it is possible that some cases will be selected for either "current" or "intensive" rehabilitation services although they are not sentenced, receive a suspended sentence or some other kind of non-sentence determination.

Other cases will be picked up immediately upon the case being assigned to probation, while others will not be picked up until after the case has been on probation for two to six months. Some cases who have been sentenced to an institution will be picked up during their incarceration. A final category of cases which have been sentenced to institutions will not be picked up until the time of their release on parole, mandatory release, or termination of sentence.

Eight regional Projects will provide cases from varying stages of the correctional process according to the following three plans:

1) Plan A

Under this plan monitoring of cases will begin as soon as a case is received at the probation office. Cases will include eligible probationers and releasees only; no pre-sentence cases will be included. The vocational counselor will be attached to the probation and parole office. The counselor will review the case as soon as it is received in the office in order to make the initial classification. Four regional Projects will provide data concerning cases under this plan: Atlanta, Chicago, Raleigh and Seattle.

2) Plan B

Under this plan monitoring of cases will begin two to six months after the case has been assigned to the probation office. Cases will include eligible probationers and releasees only; no pre-sentence cases will be included. The vocational counselor will be attached to the probation and parole office. The counselor will review the case two months after the case has been received in the probation office and will at that time make the initial classification. Three regional Projects will provide data concerning cases under this plan: Pittsburg, San Antonio, and Springfield.

3) Plan C

Under this plan monitoring of cases will begin for eligible incarcerated cases as soon as the project

is operating, for eligible pre-sentence cases as each case is assigned to the probation office. Cases will include eligible incarcerated and pre-sentence cases. The vocational counselor will be attached either to the probation and parole office or to the institution, whichever is locally appropriate. The counselor will review and classify the case as soon as the project is operating for incarcerated cases and as soon as the case is reviewed in the probation office for pre-sentence cases. Three regional projects will provide data concerning cases under this plan: Atlanta, Denver, Seattle.

4) Random Assignment of Clients to Experimental Categories

The preceding three plans insure that clients who are to be monitored by this field experiment will come from each of the major stages in the correctional process. There still remains the problem of how to decide which clients are to receive "intensive" and which are to receive "current" rehabilitation services, as well as which are to receive no rehabilitation services at all. The method for assigning clients into demonstration or control groups will be the responsibility of the Program Director through his research staff. This method is spelled out below.

a) Consecutively Numbered List of Potentials

All Projects will list consecutively all of the cases which they monitor. Each Project will maintain such a consecutively numbered list. This list will be known as the List of Potentials. Each week every Project will send to the Program Director in Seattle a copy of their new additions to the consecutively numbered List of Potentials.

b) Determination of Eligibility

As soon as a case enters the monitoring system at any given Project, its eligibility for rehabilitation service will be determined by the Project Director. At this point he will indicate for each case on the monitoring List of Potentials either "eligible" or "not eligible." For each case considered "not eligible," the Director will indicate the reason(s) as listed below. All

persons on the List of Potentials will be eligible for rehabilitation services except those who are:

(1) Less than sixteen or more than fifty-five years of age at the time assigned to the List of Potentials.

(2) At the time of inclusion in the list, residing at greater than commuting distance from the project headquarters. This distance will be specified by the respective Project Directors.

(3) Aliens subject to deportation.

(4) Under Plan C, those whose minimum expiration date is beyond October 31, 1967.

(5) Females. Except for the Chicago Project which will be exclusively concerned with females and therefore will classify males as "not eligible."

(6) Not in need. A person shall be considered to be in need of services other than counseling within the meaning of this act who does not have resources sufficient to provide himself and dependents with food, shelter and such other items as are necessary to afford a reasonable subsistence.

c) Assignment into Factorial Design

The Program Director, upon receiving the monitoring lists from a given Project, will utilize random assignment techniques to allocate all cases classified as "eligible" into either "demonstration" or "control" categories in the experiment.

The Program Director will then notify the appropriate Project Director to administer "intensive" rehabilitation services to those cases which have been randomly assigned to the "demonstration" category. The respective Project Directors will instruct their rehabilitation counselors accordingly with the proviso that they are not to initiate nor administer any rehabilitation services to those cases assigned to the "control" category. Services are to be given only to "demonstration" cases.

It is anticipated that some cases which will be designated as "controls" in this research program would under normal circumstances be referred to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration by the agency which has supervisory authority over the case. If such an agency on its own initiative and discretion refers the case to VRA, then VRA will

administer whatever services it would normally administer in such a case. However, under no circumstances will the counselor assigned to a Project under this Program provide these services. Furthermore, should a case designated as a 'control" be given "current" service by VRA personnel through the normally available channels, this fact will be noted and reported to the Program Director in Seattle. This will facilitate precise analysis and evaluation as to the effectiveness of "intensive" and "current" services.

e. Factorial Design of the Field Experiment: the Comparative Plan

The major experimental variables of the research program have already been specified in the preceding discussions. In this section a graphic presentation of the overall factorial design is presented. Cases will be randomly assigned to demonstration and control groups. Each of the twenty-four factorial categories constitutes a combination of the three major experimental variables: stage of the correctional process at which a case is picked up for monitoring, initial classification of the case by the rehabilitation officer, and whether the case is given "intensive" or "current" rehabilitation service.

BASIC EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

STAGE IN CORREC. PROCESS:	Pre-Sentence			Probation			Pre-Release			Post-Release		
INITIAL CLASSIFICATION:	B	ID	NB	B	ID	NB	B	ID	NB	B	ID	NB
DEMONSTRATION: Selected for "Intensive" Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
CONTROL: Selected for "Current" Services	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24

In the preceding graph the symbols B, ID, and NB refer to the initial classification which the project counselor will make of each particular case as follows: B: Eligible and likely to benefit from rehabilitation services; ID: eligible but indeterminate as to likelihood of benefit from services; and NB: eligible but not likely to benefit from services. This factorial experimental design will allow each of the twelve demonstration categories to be compared with the corresponding control category. Thus, on a sound empirical research basis it will be possible to say that "intensive" service is more (or less) effective than "current" service when it is given to federal offenders at the pre-sentence stage of the correctional process, and so on for all comparisons. A note should be made to the effect that a separate analysis will be made of cases picked up at the post-release stage. The effectiveness of "intensive" versus "current" rehabilitation services for cases released under supervision and for those released without supervision will be analyzed separately.

The criteria upon which "effectiveness" will be evaluated will be called "success criteria" and will be discussed under the heading of "data collection." The extent to which "demonstration" and "control" groups vary on the success criteria will be empirically assessed by a variety of statistical models. Tests of statistical significance will be utilized to assess departures from hypothesized expectations which may be explained on the basis of "random" and "measurement" error. The factorial design will not only allow the use of simple descriptive statistics but will also permit the use of more powerful statistical tools such as analysis of variance.

f. Data Collection

Data will be collected on all cases in each of the twenty-four experimental categories. Data collection devices will include questionnaires, inventories, and other instruments developed by the Program Director and his research staff. Detailed directions concerning the use of all instruments and procedures connected with the program will be compiled in a handbook or operating manual which will be sent to all Project Directors. Data collected through these instruments will be utilized in assessing the effectiveness of both "intensive" and "current" rehabilitation services which are provided to all cases monitored through the Program.

1) Success Criteria

The effectiveness of "intensive" versus "current" rehabilitation services will be assessed in terms of the extent to

which they are successful in re-establishing the federal offender to a productive and law abiding role in society. Exactly what constitutes "a productive and law-abiding role in society" is an indeterminate concept of complex proportions. Although the following criteria of success may not constitute an exhaustive list, they are intended to reflect the underlying dimensions of the concept:

(a) Non-institutionalization. The proportion of time monitored that a releasee spends without being re-committed to local, state, or federal institutions of any kind.

(b) Regularity of employment. The proportion of time monitored in full-time employment (or equivalent in part-time employment). In the Chicago Project, an analogous estimate will be made for a woman keeping house for her own family.

(c) Total earnings. The average monthly earnings by the client's own efforts during time monitored.

(d) Economic independence. Evaluated by the proportion of personal support which stems from own earned income during the time monitored. (An analogous estimate will be made for women.) The proportion of the offender's personal support which does not stem from his own earnings (economic dependence) will also be assessed by:

    (1) Proportion coming from personal relations such as friends and family.

    (2) Proportion coming from public services such as state and federal welfare agencies.

(e) Social participation A composite rating based on membership in organizations such as churches, clubs, and unions and on the amount of time spent with non-delinquent persons (except immediate family) away from work.

(f) Socially acceptable behavior. A rating to be based on number of arrests, seriousness of offenses, agency records, or complaints registered by others either to community police authorities, community agencies, to the counselor, to the offender's family, or to the client himself.

(g) Personal alienation. A rating based on an offender's responses to an instrument assessing the extent to which he perceives himself to be alienated from law-abiding society. Available instruments will be utilized to assess the extent to which the offender has a generalized perception:

(1) that socially disapproved means are required to achieve any given goal.

(2) that he cannot accurately predict the future consequences of his own immediate behavior.

(3) that his own behavior is not intrinsically worthwhile.[3]

(h) General adjustment index. A weighted total of preceding indices.

2) Instruments for Data Collection

The Program Director and his research staff are in the process of developing instruments designed to collect data by which to measure the dimensions on which the overall Program will be evaluated. These instruments will include the following:

(a) Questionnaire to assess the impact upon the attitudes and practices of professional staff as a consequence of having available a program which provides "intensive" rehabilitation services to federal offenders.

(b) Questionnaires to assess each of the dimensions on which effectiveness of "intensive" versus "current" rehabilitation services will be assessed.

(c) A data-monitoring system which will include a computer program and card code for storing and retrieving data on each offender processed through each Project.

---

3. Melvin Seeman, "Alienation and Social Learning in a Reformatory," The American Sociological Review, vol. 69 (November, 1963) 270-284.

E. PREVIOUS WORK DONE BY APPLICANT

In the State of Washington there are three major sources of previous work related to the proposed study. First the State of Washington through its Division of Vocational Rehabilitation has conducted an inquiry into the potential effects of providing vocational rehabilitation services to federal and state offenders in the Spokane area. As yet no formal reports have been issued, but informal reports indicate favorable findings.

A second area of study has occurred in the State of Washington. Since 1955, public offenders (both federal and state) have received vocational rehabilitation when actually referred for such services by the Department of Public Assistance. After July of 1963 public offenders no longer had to be referred and could qualify for services upon making direct application themselves. Other states have indicated an interest in this program. However, other states are understandably hesitant to institute such programs when there is no available evidence as to their effectiveness.

A third area of study has been conducted by the applicant. The applicant has received a planning grant from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration for the purpose of making preliminary plans for the study outlined in the present request. The title of the planning grant was: A PLANNING STUDY PRELIMINARY TO DETERMINING THE NEED FOR AND THE MOST EFFECTIVE MEANS OF PROVIDING VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION FOR FEDERAL OFFENDERS: RD-1819 G-65. This study was put into effect on April 1, 1965 and is still in progress. The applicant has made thorough and complete arrangements with all agencies which are to participate as collaborators in this research. The applicant has made detailed job specifications for the various positions necessary to conduct the research program. The applicant has prepared an overall research plan, the narrative portion of this request. Finally, the applicant is in the process of constructing the necessary instruments and data monitoring system to actually conduct the research as planned.

F. PERSONNEL AND BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

1. Program Staff

Program Director. The Program Director will have overall responsibility for implementation of the collaborative research program. He will coordinate the research and administrative activities of eight Projects and will be responsible for maintaining liason with institutions, social agencies and other cooperating groups at a Federal and State

level. He will be responsible for explaining the research activities to these agencies and for preventing the contamination of the overall research design.

The person selected for this position is Mr. Percy B. Bell. Prior to taking on the duties of Program Director, Mr. Bell was Chief of Vocational Counseling, Training, and Adjustment Section of the Veterans Administration. In this capacity he had responsibility for counseling and rehabilitation training in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana and for providing counseling services in Alaska.

Research Director. The Research Director will be responsible for planning of overall experimental research design, data collection, and data analysis in line with the overall research plan. He will be responsible for developing studies to take advantage of research opportunities as they appear, and for the writing of semi-annual and final reports.

The person to fill this position has not yet been selected. Minimal requirements will include the following: Although a master's degree will be acceptable, it is preferred that the candidate have a doctorate in psychology sociology, or social work (provided that his training has heavily emphasized research methodology).

Observer. The Observer will provide an independent source of information and observation to assist the Program Director in the development of administrative procedures in delineating the roles of the various personnel involved in the collaborative research and demonstration program. He will assist observers attached to each regional project in developing uniform observation systems for assessing the impact of program procedures on the client, the project staff, and staff of the collaborating agencies. In his absence the Program Director may delegate administrative authority to the observer.

The person selected for this position is Mr. Claude Pangborn. Mr. Pangborn is presently Counseling Psychologist at Seattle University. Before this Mr. Pangborn was Counseling Psychologist for the Veterans Administration Regional Office in Seattle. Mr. Pangborn is a member of several professional associations including: American Personnel and Guidance Association, and the National Rehabilitation Association.

Sociological and Research Consultants. The sociological and research consultants will be available on a temporary or part-time basis to assist the Program Director and the Research

Director in the planning of the overall experimental research design, data collection, and data analysis according to the overall research plan.

Three persons have been selected for this purpose:

1. Clarence C. Schrag, Ph.D.
2. Herbert L. Costner, Ph.D.
3. Daniel Glaser, Ph.D.
4. Rodolfo Alvarez, M.A.

Administrative and Clerical Staff

Secretary (full time)
Statistical Clerk (full time)
Clerk typist (part time)
Auditing and legal services will be obtained from qualified professionals as needed.

2. Staffing of Satellite Projects

Each satellite Project will function through a Project Director, Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor, Project Secretary, Project Consultant, and a Project Observer.

It is anticipated that the Project Director will be on a released time basis from a regular Vocational Rehabilitation assignment and without charge to the Project funds. The Project Consultant will be normally from the faculty of a nearby university and will be paid on a part-time basis. The Project Observer will be a faculty member or an advanced graduate student on a paid part-time basis. The full-time Vocational Counselor will be encouraged to make maximum use of auxiliary services in diagnosis, treatment, and evaluation.

II SEATTLE FEDERAL OFFENDERS REHABILITATION COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT

A. PURPOSE

For a statement of the general purpose of the Seattle Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Project see I-A; I-C.1 2 & 3; and I-D.3.d.1 & 3 in the description of the Federal Offenders Program above. Within the framework of the Program, the specific objectives of the Seattle Project are to measure the

effectiveness of "intensive" versus "current" rehabilitation services for federal offenders at four stages of the correctional process: pre-sentence, probation, pre-release from a federal institution, and post-release from the institution.

B. TYPE: Collaborative Research and Demonstration

This project will involve the collaboration of the Federal Probation Office in Seattle, Washington, the Federal Penitentiary at Steilacoom, Washington and the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Office of Superintendent of Schools, State of Washington. The collaborative process will be assured by the use of an Executive Committee composed of the Project Director; the Chief Probation Officer of Seattle; the Chief Classification and Parole Officer, Federal Penitentiary; Director of Extended Services of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation; Professor, School of Social Work at the University of Washington; Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Washington; and the District Supervisor, Seattle District, DVR. Other personnel will be invited to attend meetings of this committee by the Project Director as he deems pertinent to a particular problem.

C. JUSTIFICATION

1. SPECIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM TO WHICH THE SEATTLE FEDERAL OFFENDERS REHABILITATION COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT IS AIMED

The problem to which the Seattle Project is addressed is encompassed by the objectives of the overall Program. However, the specific objectives of the Seattle Project are:

a. To participate in an overall program designed to measure the effectiveness of "intensive" versus "current" rehabilitation services for federal offenders, in the Seattle area, who are at any one of four stages in the correctional process: pre-sentence, probation, pre-release from the Federal Penitentiary, Steilacoom, and post-release from the Penitentiary.

b. To study the effect of providing intensive rehabilitation services to offenders upon the attitudes and practices of the professional staff of various agencies in the correctional process. For example, availability of services for an offender at the pre-sentence stage may affect not only the recommendations which are made in the pre-sentence report, but also the kind of sentence which the offender receives from the court.

2. SALIENCY OF THE PROBLEM ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

The extent to which the problems under investigation in the Seattle Project are common in the United States is discussed under I-C,2. above.

Washington State is unique in that for several years it has provided vocational rehabilitation for two principal types of persons which this research project will investigate: a. Those persons who have physical and mental handicaps and who therefore qualify for service under normal Federal-State criteria. b. Those persons who do not qualify for Federal-State services because they do not have a physical or mental handicap but who do qualify for rehabilitation services under Washington State's program for the non-disabled because they have some kind of social handicap. Other states provide services only for the physically or mentally handicapped.

Washington State is presumed to be in the forefront in providing professional rehabilitation services for all persons without regard to the type of handicap. Professional personnel in the field of rehabilitation throughout the country have noted that large numbers of persons in their geographical regions go without rehabilitation services because they do not have the physical or mental handicaps which are legally required to qualify for such services. The studies by Brewer and by Glaser cited under I-C.2 above have shown that the "federal offender" is a category of persons among whom social handicaps of various sorts predominate.

3. SPECIFIC CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE IN THE FIELD OF REHABILITATION

A unique feature of the Seattle Project is that it will provide an empirical answer as to whether or not providing services to the socially handicapped is effective. While there is much enthusiastic support for the results of this type of service, there is no empirical evidence which supports claims as to its effectiveness. Because of the experimental research design, the results will demonstrate whether this kind of service is more effective, just as effective, or less effective than normal services for the rehabilitation of socially handicapped persons.

Because federal offenders are a category of persons among whom social handicaps predominate, they constitute an ideal population within which to conduct a field experiment on the effectiveness of providing "intensive" rehabilitation

for the socially handicapped.

The results of this experiment will provide empirical evidence upon which to assess the effectiveness of "intensive" versus "current" rehabilitation services not only for the physically and mentally handicapped, but also for the socially handicapped. If the answer turns out to be affirmative, then the extra expenditure of public funds in Washington State will be justified. Furthermore, if the answer is affirmative, then other states throughout the country will have empirical evidence upon which to make changes in their rehabilitation policy and in their public laws.

D. METHODOLOGY

1. COLLABORATING AGENCIES

The Project will be conducted through the cooperation of the following agencies as provided by a cooperative agreement among the U. S. Probation Office, Western District of Washington; the Federal Penitentiary, Steilacoom, Washington; Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, State of Washington. It is further contemplated that close coordination will be maintained with the Washington State Employment Service.

2. PROJECT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

This committee will be composed of representatives of the collaborating agencies and Project Consultants. The Project Director appointed by the Assistant State Superintendent for Vocational Rehabilitation will provide leadership and continuity. He will be responsible for coordinating the work of the personnel involved and the submission of reports and data for the Project. The Chief Probation and Parole Officer, Seattle, will provide access to case files, notice of new cases assigned to his office, office space for one VR Officer and his Project Clerk, and will interpret the Project to his staff. The Chief Classification and Parole Officer, Federal Penitentiary at Steilacoom, will arrange facilities for another VR Officer during the time he is working at the institution and coordinate all the activities connected with the prison population being studied. The Project Consultant will assure objectivity and be available for the development of ideas and concepts relating to the

Project. The Observer will study processes, procedures, and concepts. He will assist the Director in developing the roles to be played by various personnel connected with the Project. The Project Director may delegate authority to the Project Observer on any special problems that may develop in the research or administration of the Project.

3. EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE

The Project will have an Employment Committee composed of the VR Officer as Chairman, a Probation Officer, and a representative of the Employment Service. It will be the responsibility of this committee to assist in the individual placement of the offender and to help build a positive attitude in the community toward the employment of federal offenders.

4. WORKING LOCATIONS

One VR Officer will work at the Probation and Parole Office in the Federal Courthouse, Seattle; the other will have an office in the Orpheum Building in Seattle and a secondary office at the penitentiary at Steilacoom.

5. RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The nationwide Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Collaborative Research Program will have responsibility for coordinating the research activities of all the regional Projects including the Seattle Project. Specifications for the research to be conducted by the Seattle Project will conform in detail to the specifications spelled out in the Program grant request under I-D,1.,2. & 3. above.

6. FACILITIES AVAILABLE

In addition to the cooperation of normal probation, parole, and rehabilitative agencies, the Seattle Project will have at its disposal the services of the Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation of the University of Washington Hospital and School of Medicine. Research facilities available through the University of Washington include the services of the Institute for Sociological Research as well as the faculties of the Departments of Psychology, Sociology, and Social Work.